

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/595,528	06/16/2000	Scott E. Landau	IFF-101	IFF-101 2190	
75	90 10/09/2003		EXAMINER		
Barry R Lipsit	Barry R Lipsitz			RUDY, ANDREW J	
755 Main Street	: Building 8				
Monroe, CT 06468			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
·			3627	3627	

DATE MAILED: 10/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/595,528	LANDAU ET AL.	λ			
2	Examin r	Art Unit	0			
	Andrew Joseph Rudy	3627				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ars on the cover she t with the	orrespondence address	,			
THE REPLY FILED 29 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE:						
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.	tion(s):					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	· · · ——	separate, timely filed ame	endment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the term consolidated does not define over the prior art.						
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be			wly			
raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment			เท			
explanation of how the new or amended claims w The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•	ow or appended.				
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet						

Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant's comments that the Examiner agreed that the present claims distinguish over the Moore reference is erroneous. No such affirmative comments to Applicant's counsel were made by Examiner Rudy. See Examiner Interview Summary, Paper No. 9.

Archent Joseph Rody October 8, 2003